

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

#19

Applicant: Bieser, et al.

Serial No.: 09/032,893

Filed: February 27, 1998

Title: HOMOGENEOUSLY BRANCHED  
ETHYLENE POLYMER CARPET,  
CARPET BACKING AND METHOD  
FOR MAKING SAME

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Examiner: Juska, C.

Group No. 1771

RECEIVED  
JUL 31 2001  
TC 1700 HALL ROOM

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

Dear Sir:

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY EXPRESS MAIL**

"EXPRESS MAIL" Mailing Label No.: EK287121932US  
Date of Deposit July 25, 2001

I hereby certify that this paper, including the documents referred to therein, or fee is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231

Type or Print Name: Kim Kennedy

Signature

**REPLY TO NOTICE OF IMPROPER REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION  
(RCE) MAILED JUNE 28, 2001**

In response to the Notice of Improper Request for Continued Examination mailed June 28, 2001, the Applicants are treating the notice as an Office Action requiring the complete submission of the previous response. Therefore this reply is timely filed.

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 and 9-12 are pending in this application. The Applicants are replying to the Notice of Improper Request for Continued Examination as an Office Action requiring the complete submission of the previous response. The Applicants filed a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) Request Transmittal on May 30, 2001 in response to a non-final Office Action mailed on November 30, 2000. The CPA Request Transmittal was treated as an RCE because the CPA was filed on an application that was filed on or after May 29, 2000. As such, the CPA was turned into an RCE and the RCE was incomplete since no submission was filed with it. Under MPEP § 714.03, where a reply is a bona fide attempt to advance the application to final action, but contains an

omission, the Examiner **should**, if there is insufficient time remaining, issue an Office Action setting a one-month time period to complete the reply pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.135(c). The Applicants respectfully submit that the following is a complete response to the Office Action and that it is timely filed under MPEP § 714.03.

#### **RESPONSE TO REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 (A)**

Claims 1-6 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 93/15909 issued to Fink in view of US 5,741,594 issued to Jialanella. The Examiner states:

The pending claims are rejected as being obvious over the cited Fink patent, which teaches the claimed carpet structure, in view of the cited Jialanella patent, which discloses the specific adhesive. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the Jialanella homogeneously branched polyethylene adhesive for the thermoplastic polyolefin adhesive disclosed by Fink. Motivation to do so would be the explicitly teaching by Jialanella that said adhesive is suitable for carpet backings.

*Office Action of November 30, 2000, page 4-5.*

Applicants have reviewed the above references and respectfully disagree that the above references render the claimed invention obvious. Applicants' reasons are stated as follows.

#### **A. Applicable Law.**

To reject claims of an application under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), an examiner has the burden of establishing an unrebutted prima facie case of obviousness. See *In re Deuel*, 51 F.3d 1552, 1557, 34 U.S.P.Q.2d 1210, 1214 (Fed. Cir. 1995). In the absence of a proper prima facie case of obviousness, an applicant who complies with the other statutory requirements is entitled to a patent. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992). One important indication of non-obviousness is the "teaching away" from the claimed invention by the prior art or by experts in the art at or after the time the invention was made. See *U.S. v. Adams*, 383 US 39 (1966).

Teaching away is the antithesis of the art's suggesting that the person of ordinary skill go in the claimed direction. Teaching away from the art is a per se demonstration of lack of *prima facie* obviousness. See *In re Dow Chemical Co.*, 837 F.2d 469, 5 USPQ2d 1529 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re*

Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 UPSQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Nielson, 816 F.2d 1567, 2 USPQ2d 1525 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

## **B. Application of the Law.**

### **1. CLAIMS 1-6 AND 9-12 ARE NOT RENDERED OBVIOUS BY *FINK* AND *JIALANELLA* BECAUSE *FINK* TEACHES AWAY FROM USING POLYETHYLENE AS AN ADHESIVE BACKING.**

Claims 1-6 and 9-12 are directed to a carpet including (a) a primary backing, (b) a plurality of fibers attached to the primary backing, (c) an adhesive backing, (d) an optional secondary backing adjacent to the adhesive backing, wherein the adhesive backing is comprised of at least one homogeneously branched ethylene polymer characterized as having a short chain branching index (SCBDI) of greater than or equal to 50% and is in intimate contact with the primary backing and has substantially penetrated and substantially consolidated fibers.

*Fink* discloses a carpet including a primary backing having tufts of synthetic carpet fibers protruding from a top surface and optionally, a secondary backing with an extruded sheet of an isotactic polyolefin polymer between and integrally fused to a bottom surface of the primary backing and an upper surface of the secondary backing. It provides a list of compositions that may or may not be suitable for use in the extruded sheet. See *Fink*, Table A, page 20. One of the properties listed is the expected bonding strength with polypropylene. Four groups of materials were investigated: polypropylene, polyethylene, polybutylene, and elastomeric alloy TPE's. All polyethylene examples have poor bond strength, except for polyethylene ionomer. According to *Fink*, polyethylene (other than its ionomers) is not suitable for adhesively bonding tufted carpet to the primary backing. Given the uniform unacceptability of polyethylene polymers in *Fink*'s disclosure, one of ordinary skill in the art would not experiment with additional polyethylene polymers for use in extrusion backed carpet applications. **Therefore, *Fink* does not teach or suggest the use of a homogeneously branched ethylene polymer as the extruded sheet, but actually teaches away from using homogeneously branched ethylene polymers as the extruded sheet.** Because *Fink* teaches away from using ethylene polymers, it cannot be properly combined with *Jialanella*.

requirements is entitled to a patent. The Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is non-obvious and thus patentable.


#### CONCLUSION

The Applicants have addressed all of the Examiner's rejections and believe that the claims are now in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner grant such an action. If any questions or issues remain in the resolution of which the Examiner feels will be advanced by a conference with the Applicants' attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the attorney at the number noted below.

No fee is believed to be required for this submission. Should there be any additional fees required, please charge such additional fees to Deposit Account 10-0447, reference 43225.41824BUSP(BAI).

Respectfully submitted,

JENKENS & GILCHRIST  
A Professional Corporation



J. Benjamin Bai, Ph.D.

Reg. No. 43,481

Date: 7/25/2001  
Jenkins & Gilchrist,  
A Professional Corporation  
1100 Louisiana St., Ste. 1800  
Houston, Texas 77002  
Telephone: (713) 951-3387  
Fax: (713) 951-3314



Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NUMBER FILING DATE

FIRST NAMED APPLICANT

ATTY. DOCKET NO./TITLE

09/032,893

02/27/98

BIESER

JUL - 5 2001

41824B

IM71/0825

OSBORNE K MCKINNEY  
B 1211

2301 BRAZOSPORT BOULEVARD  
FREEPORT TX 77541

DATE MAILED: JUL 31 2001

**NOTICE OF IMPROPER REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION (RCE)**

The request for continued examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 filed on 5-30-01 is improper for reason(s) indicated below:

- ☐ 1. Continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 does not apply to an application for a design patent. Applicant may wish to consider filing a continuing application under 37 CFR 1.53(b) or a CPA under 37 CFR 1.53(d).
- ☐ 2. Continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 does not apply to an application that was filed before June 8, 1995. Applicant may wish to consider filing a continuing application under 37 CFR 1.53(b) or a CPA under 37 CFR 1.53(d).
- ☒ 3. Continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 does not apply to an application unless prosecution in the application is closed. If the RCE was accompanied by a reply to a non-final Office action, the reply will be entered and considered under 37 CFR 1.111. If the RCE was not accompanied by a reply, the time period set forth in the last Office action continues to run from the mailing date of that action.
- ☐ 4. The request was not filed before payment of the issue fee, and no petition under 37 CFR 1.313 was granted. If this application has not yet issued as a patent, applicant may wish to consider filing either a petition under 37 CFR 1.313 to withdraw this application from issue, or a continuing application under 37 CFR 1.53(b).
- ☐ 5. The request was not filed before abandonment of the application. The application was abandoned, or proceedings terminated on \_\_\_\_\_. Applicant may wish to consider filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.137 to revive this abandoned application.
- ☐ 6. The request was not accompanied by the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) as required by 37 CFR 1.114. Since the application is not under appeal, the time period set forth in the final Office action or notice of allowance continues to run from the mailing date of that action or notice.
- ☒ 7. The request was not accompanied by a submission as required by 37 CFR 1.114. Since the application is not under appeal, the time period set forth in the final Office action or notice of allowance continues to run from the mailing date of that action or notice.

**Note:** If a request for a continued prosecution application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) has been filed in the utility or plant application (including a previously filed CPA) that was filed on or after May 29, 2000, the request for a CPA has been treated as a RCE because the CPA practice no longer applies to such application. The constructive RCE, however, is improper for reason(s) indicated above.

**A copy of this notice MUST be returned with any reply.**

Direct the reply and any questions about this notice to:

Henry M. McKinney, Examining Group 1771

(703) 308-2400  
FORM PTO-2051 (Rev. 3/2001)



Attorney Docket  
No. 43225.41824B

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY EXPRESS MAIL

I, Kim Kennedy, do hereby certify that the foregoing documents are being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail Post Office to Addressee Service, postage prepaid, prior to the last scheduled pickup, in an envelope addressed to Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on this date of July 25, 2001.

Kim Kennedy  
Name

Kim Kennedy  
Signature


EK287121932US

Express Mail Label Number

July 25, 2001  
Date of Deposit

RECEIVED  
JUL 31 2001  
TC 1700 MAIL ROOM





The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees required for this submission to Deposit Account 10-0447, reference 43225.41824BUSP(BAI),

Respectfully submitted,

JENKENS & GILCHRIST  
A Professional Corporation

J. Benjamin Bai

J. Benjamin Bai  
Reg. No. 43,481

Date:

7/25/01

Jenkins & Gilchrist  
A Professional Corporation  
1100 Louisiana, Ste. 1800  
Houston, Texas 77002  
Phone: (713) 951-3387  
Fax: (713) 951-3314

RECEIVED  
JUL 31 2001  
TC 1700 MAIL ROOM